

memory address by determining said decoded memory address randomly associated with said encoded memory address.

REMARKS

In the Office Action, all claims were rejected as being either anticipated or unpatentable in view of the art. The primary references applied were U.S. Patent No. 6,048,269 to Burns, et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,475,205 to Behm, et al.

A power of attorney and revocation of prior powers, a Rule 3.73B certification, and a supplemental information disclosure statement are filed herewith.

In the above amendments, claims 1-78 were cancelled and claims 79-90 have been added. A number of paragraphs in the "Background" section have been deleted, and the original "Summary of the Invention" section of the specification has been replaced with a new summary section that is consistent with the new claims pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.73, which states that "Such summary should, when set forth, be commensurate with the invention as claimed..."

In view of above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claim Construction

Although the present application describes various embodiments and makes various statements regarding the "invention," it is well settled that the legal scope of the invention is defined by the words of the claims and that it is improper to read features of the embodiments described in the specification of a patent into the claims. It should also be recognized that the term "invention" may be used to mean various different things. For example, the term "invention" may be used to refer to the technical subject matter that has been invented; the term "invention" may be used to refer to subject matter which is nonobvious; and the term "invention" may be used to refer to subject matter defined by the claims of a patent.¹ Thus,

¹ This is explained in the Glossary of Volume 1 of Chisum on Patents, where the term "invention" is defined as follows:

the mere fact that the present application uses the term "invention" in various statements does not mean that the scope of the claims is limited by such statements.

It should also be understood that, unless a term is expressly defined in the present application using the sentence "As used herein, the term '_____' is hereby defined to mean..." or a similar sentence, there is no intent to limit the meaning of that term, either expressly or by implication, beyond its plain or ordinary meaning, and such term should not be interpreted to be limited in scope based on any statement made in any section of the present application (other than the language of the claims). Finally, unless a claim element is defined by recital of the word "means" and a function without the recital of any structure, it is not intended that the scope of any claim element be interpreted based on the application of 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph.

It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing comments regarding claim construction are consistent with 35 U.S.C. §112 and the Office practice of utilizing the "broadest reasonable interpretation" of claims.

Discussion

New claim 79 is directed to a casino gaming system comprising, inter alia, a central processing apparatus, a gaming machine and a change machine. Claim 79 recites:

said controller of said central processing apparatus
being programmed to encrypt said memory address to form an
encrypted memory address;

said controller of said central processing apparatus
being programmed to transmit data representing said encrypted
memory address to said change machine; and

said controller of said change machine being
programmed to cause said bar code printer of said change
machine to print a bar code representing said encrypted
memory address.

INVENTION – In patent law, the word 'invention' has several different meanings. It may refer to (1) the act of invention through original conception and reduction to practice; (2) subject matter described and/or claimed in a patent, patent application or prior art reference (e.g., a product or process); or (3) the patentability requirement of invention, first developed by the courts and now subsumed in the statutory requirement of nonobviousness. Thus, an applicant may have invented (1) an invention (2) which is unpatentable for lack of invention (3) because it is an obvious modification of an invention (2) used by others in this country before the invention (1) thereof by the applicant.

It is believed that the underlined portions of claim 79 are neither disclosed nor suggested by Burns, et al. and/or Behm, et al.

New claim 80 is directed to a casino gaming system comprising, inter alia, a central processing apparatus and a gaming machine. New claim 80 recites:

bar code reader that reads a bar code representing an encrypted memory address;

said controller of said gaming machine being programmed to transmit data representing said encrypted memory address to said central processing apparatus;

said controller of said central processing apparatus being programmed to decrypt said encrypted memory address data to generate an unencrypted memory address;

said controller of said central processing apparatus being programmed to utilize said unencrypted memory address to make a status check as to whether a monetary amount has been paid;

It is believed that the underlined portions of claim 80 are neither disclosed nor suggested by Burns, et al. and/or Behm, et al.

New claim 81 is directed to a casino gaming system comprising, inter alia, a central processing apparatus, a gaming machine and a change machine. New claim 81 recites:

said controller of said change machine being programmed to transmit encrypted address data to said central processing apparatus, said transmitted data being generated based on bar code data generated by said bar code reader;

said controller of said central processing apparatus being programmed to decrypt said encrypted address data to generate an unencrypted memory address;

said controller of said central processing apparatus being programmed to utilize said unencrypted memory address to make a status check as to whether a monetary amount has been paid;

It is believed that the underlined portions of claim 81 are neither disclosed nor suggested by Burns, et al. and/or Behm, et al.

It is believed that the subject matter of claims 82-90 is neither disclosed nor suggested by Burns, et al. and/or Behm, et al.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the above application is in condition for allowance. If there is any matter that the Examiner would like to discuss, she is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN

Date: June 12, 2002

By:



Martin J. Hirsch

Registration No. 32,237

6300 Sears Tower

233 South Wacker Drive

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300